

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 08 2006

REMARKS

Claims 25-33 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. New claims 43-46 have been added to this application. Support for these added claims can be found, for example, in paragraph [0032].

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6-7, 6-12, 14-16, 18-22, 24 and 34-42 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,970,095) in view of Freeman (WO 00/39602). The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Contrary to what is stated in the Office Action, Freeman fails to teach or suggest that the theft protection system is configured to "display a graphical user interface for a user of the portable electronic device to initiate the theft prevention system or to set one or more parameters to be used by the theft prevention system in detecting a theft condition." The Office Action refers to Freeman's use of an authorization code/password to arm or disarm the alarm as allegedly teaching this element. However, an authorization code is not a parameter used by the theft prevention system in detecting a theft condition. The authorization code simply tells the system whether it should enable its theft detection capabilities (or disable them if enabled already). In other words, the authorization code merely tells the system that it should or should not be performing the detection function, but is not a parameter used when the system is actually performing the detecting. Examples of parameters to be used by the theft prevention system in detecting a theft condition are provided in the Specification of the present application, paragraphs [0025] - [0028], which include whether an audio alarm should sound, the level of the volume, the ramp up time, a visual alarm message, and the sensitivity of the device, among others. Neither Freeman nor Lee nor their combination teach or suggest anything about configuration of parameters used in detecting a theft condition, let alone a user interface for receiving the parameters. For at least these reasons, the rejection of claim 1 is unsupported by the art and it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Independent claim 9 is directed to a portable electronic device having a system for protecting against theft, and contains limitations relating the graphical user interface that are similar to the limitations of claim 1, discussed above. Thus, for reasons similar to those set forth above, the rejection of claim 9 is unsupported by the art and it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Independent claim 19 is directed to a method of protecting a portable electronic device against theft, and contains limitations relating to a graphical user interface that are similar to the limitations of claim 1. Thus, for reasons similar to those set forth above, the rejection of claim 19 is unsupported by the art and it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claims 5 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,970,095) in view of Freeman (WO 00/39602) further in view of D'Angelo et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,133,830). The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Dependent claims 2-7, 10-16, 18-22, 24 and 34-42 are also patentably distinct from the cited references for at least the same reasons as those recited above for the independent claim, upon which they ultimately depend. These dependent claims recite additional limitations that further distinguish these dependent claims from the cited references.

For at least the above-noted reasons, it is submitted claims 2-4, 6-7, 10-12, 14-16, 18-22, and 34-42 and new claims 43-46 are in condition for allowance.

The Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,  
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Marc S. Hanish  
Reg. No. 42,626

P.O. Box 70250  
Oakland, CA 94612-0250  
650-961-8300